

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4 and 5 are amended. No new matter is added by this Amendment. Support for the language added to the claims is found at, for example, Figure 8.

I. Pending Claims 1-13 Define Patentable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 2, 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,636,192 (Saitoh); claims 3, 5-7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Saitoh in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,433,767 (Murade); and claims 1-8 and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Murade in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,927,830 (Chung). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As shown in Fig. 8 of the present application, the convex portions 401 extend in a direction perpendicular to the rubbing direction RD. This configuration increases resistance of the rubbing member, thereby inducing cut dregs to be dropped from the rubbing member before the rubbing member reaches the display area. This configuration, as well as the benefits associated therewith are not taught or suggested by the applied references.

More specifically, Saitoh and Murade each fail to disclose a rubbing direction. Chung teaches a diagonal rubbing direction, as indicated by the arrows in Figs. 1, 2, 5-7 and 9-11 of Chung. The Office Action asserts that Fig. 7 of Murade discloses "projections" extending from the driver 101 to the display area (pixel). However, even if one could combine Murade with Chung, the presently claimed invention still would not be achieved because Murade and Chung fail to teach or suggest convex portions extending in a direction substantially perpendicular to a rubbing direction of the alignment film, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, Saitoh fails to cure this deficiency.

Accordingly claim 1, as well as the claims depending therefrom, is not anticipated or rendered obvious by Saitoh, Murade, and Chung, in any combination.

In addition, claims 4 and 5 recite that projected portions caused by the height of at least one of the data lines and the scanning lines is formed in the alignment film at a position directly adjacent to the display area. However, the "projected portions" of Murade (as identified in Fig. 7 the Office Action) are separated from the display area by a sampling circuit 103 and dummy pixels, as shown in Fig. 5 of Murade. Accordingly, the feature of claims 4 and 5, as well as the benefits associated therewith, cannot be achieved by Murade.

Accordingly, claims 4 and 5 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Saitoh, Murade, and Chung, in any combination, for the same reason discusses above with respect to claim 1 and for the additional feature they recite.


Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel
Registration No. 51,122

JAO:LMS/eks

Date: November 9, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
